

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,102,709 to *Howard et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,784,679 to *Sweet et al.*

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Howard et al.* in view of *Sweet et al.*, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,037,787 to *Corwith*.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 4-7 to further define the invention. Applicants have canceled claims 2 and 3. Accordingly, claims 1 and 4-8 are pending for further consideration.

All Claims Recite Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Howard et al.* in view of *Sweet et al.* Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Howard et al.* in view of *Sweet et al.*, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of *Corwith*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a first insulative substrate provided on the first face of the block. *Howard et al.* and *Sweet et al.*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1.

As amended, independent claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, an inner diameter of the first recess is larger than an inner diameter of the penetration hole. *Howard et al.* and *Sweet et al.*,

whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 4.

As pointed out in M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, all the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention. Because *Howard et al.* and *Sweet et al.*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1 and 4, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn. *Corwith* does not cure these deficiencies. Furthermore, claims 5-8 depend from one of independent claims 1 or 4. Accordingly, claims 5-8 are also allowable because of the additional features they recite and the reasons stated above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested, and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

Dated: February 5, 2008

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell, Reg. No. 33,652

Customer No. 009629
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202-739-3000
Fax: 202-739-3001